Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 1
1	WASHINGTON STATE INSURANCE COMMISSION	
2		
3	PUBLIC MEETING	
4	IN THE MATTER OF	
5	THE PROPOSED CONVERSION OF PREMERA BLUE CROSS	
6	TO A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION	
7		
8	October 2, 2002	
9	at	
10	West Coast Ridpath Hotel	
11	515 West Sprague Street	
12	Spokane, Washington	
13		
14		
15		
16	Taken Before:	
17	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR	
	Certified Court Reporter	
18	of	
	CAPITOL PACIFIC REPORTING	
19	2401 Bristol Court S.W.	
	Olympia, WA 98502	
20	360.352.2054	
	e-mail: capitolpacific@atg.com	
21	www.capitolpacificreporter.com	
22		
23		
24		
25		

Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

	Page 2
1 T M D E V	Page 2
1 INDEX 2	PAGE
3 Mike Kreidler - Insurance Commissioner	3,24,68
4 Jim Odiorne - Assistant Insurance Commissioner	3,24,00 4
	8
4	13
6 Gubby Barlow - CEO Premera Blue Cross 7 Yori Milo - Premera Blue Cross Executive VP	18
8	10
o Public Comment	
9	
Mr. Pat Chestnut	25
10 Mr. Frank Yuse	27
Mr. Len Eddinger	29
Dr. Beth Peterson	32
Dr. Doug Norquist	34
12 Dr. Bob Hartman	35
Dr. Bill Gotthold	37
13 Mr. Curtis Fackler	38
Mr. Leo Greenawalt	41
Mr. Mark Barglof	44
Ms. Barbara Schlimmer	45
15 Mr. Vic Forni	47
Ms. Charlotte Hardt	48
16 Ms. Darlene Pursley	50
Dr. Jim Watts	52
17 Dr. Glen Stream	58
Mr. Peter Jackson	60
18 Mr. Brian McAlpin	63
Ms. Carol Ellis	65
19 Mr. Garth Steele	67
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 3 1 PROCEEDINGS 3 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Good evening. My name 4 is Mike Kreidler, Washington State Insurance 5 Commissioner. And joining me are Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis and Deputy Insurance Commissioner 6 7 Jim Odiorne. And thank you for coming out tonight and 8 participating in this forum. On May 30th of this year, Premera Blue Cross, MSC as it is frequently referred to in Spokane, notified me of 10 11 their intent to convert from a nonprofit to a for-profit 12 company. Ultimately, I will be acting as a judge to decide what impact this application, if approved, would 13 14 have on the consumers of the State of Washington. However, tonight I will refrain from talking about 15 16 the merits of the proposed conversion. Our primary 17 concerns with the application are that the consumers are 18 not harmed by a conversion, potential impact on Premera's 19 solvency, and obtaining an accurate valuation of Premera's assets. 20 21 This evening's agenda, it is critical that we hear 22 from the public early in this process of application, and 23 that is clearly what we're here for tonight, is to hear 24 from citizens and consumers of the State of Washington.

We are going to try to keep our comments to a

25

Page 4 minimum. We will begin by hearing from -- ten minutes 1 from Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne, to my right, followed by Assistant Attorney General Fallis, who 4 will have a ten-minute presentation. Following them will 5 be Premera Blue Cross, who will have 15 minutes to describe their conversion proposal. And then we're going 6 7 to open it up to public comment, which is the principal 8 reason that we're here. I would like to turn now to Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne. 10 11 MR. ODIORNE: Thank you, Commissioner. 12 Good evening and welcome. Your presence here, your comments are truly helpful to us in this process as we 13 14 review the transaction as it has been proposed. As the Commissioner indicated, Premera filed with us 15 16 a Form A application. Form A is regulator lingo for 17 change of control. Whenever as much as 10 percent or 18 more of a company changes control, the Form A is 19 required, and with the Form A, review by our office. 20 do two or three Form A's each year. The Premera proposed transaction is the largest since the Farmers Group was 21 22 purchased. 23

The transaction that Premera has proposed has been bundled in a Form A but actually contains a number of transactions, creations of companies, intercompany

24

25

Page 5

agreements within the holding company group, solicitation permits to allow them to sell stock, and possibly other transactions. Each of those has to be reviewed individually and as it affects the whole.

The Commissioner's primary authority is the Health Carrier Holding Company Act, which was passed last year. Under that act, the transaction requires formal hearing before final decision is made. And as the Commissioner indicated, he will be acting as the judge in that hearing. And as the judge, he has to limit his access to certain information prior to the formal hearing. And for that reason, part of his staff has been walled off, if you will, so there is not an improper transfer of information back and forth so that he can maintain his judicial function.

The team -- I've been appointed to lead the review team, and my team will ultimately make a recommendation to the Commissioner based on all the information that we're able to gather and assemble, and that information will be presented at a formal hearing.

We do several of these each year, as I indicated, but this is a massive transaction. And for that reason, we have retained a number of experts to help us in the review process. Among those experts are investment bankers, actuaries, accounting and tax experts, and legal

Page 6

experts. The apparent successful bidders in our solicitation of bids all have prior experience representing other states in conversion transactions. So this is not new to them. We don't have to train them as we go. They know what's going on. We will work very closely with those consultants in developing a recommendation for the Commissioner.

We have required that the experts provide us an executive summary, which will be filed and made available to the public prior to the time of the final hearing. We did issue a preliminary time frame for this transaction that called for everything to be completed by the end of December. Things change and that time frame changes as we go. Changes we've recently heard of from the Assistant Attorney General representing the Commissioner indicate that we will not be able to finish by December.

In any event, I'm not going to ask to make a recommendation to the Commissioner until we feel that we have all the information we need, it's been thoroughly evaluated, and we have, if you would, cross-examined the experts before we make the recommendation.

Our intention is to make as much information as is legally possible available to the public. We will do that by posting on the Web site as often as we can. The Premera filing is now on our web site, as it is on

Page 7

theirs. There was a supplement to that filing that was made last Friday, and we don't have that up yet, but it should be in a day or so.

The Assistant Attorney General representing the Commissioner has indicated that there will be prefile testimony, and to the extent possible, that will also be posted on the web site. You can visit our web site at www.insurance.wa.gov and follow the process as it goes forward.

Again, we thank you for coming tonight, and we look forward to your comments.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Odiorne.

Let me, as I introduce, now, Assistant Attorney
General Rusty Fallis, point out that Attorney General
Christine Gregoire very much wanted to be here this
evening. She is representing the State interests in a
very significant negotiation on a settlement with a very
large corporation right now, that is going to have
significant penalty involved in those negotiations and
settlement. And it also represents the Insurance
Commissioner's Office, so we're very pleased that she's
representing our interests back in Chicago presently.

She very much wanted to be here and wanted me to express her personal regret that she couldn't join us

Page 8

this evening, but is very pleased that the person who is taking the lead for her in the Attorney General's Office is with us. And it's my pleasure to introduce Assistant Attorney General Fallis.

MR. FALLIS: Thank you, Commissioner Kreidler.

And I'll echo the Commissioner's remarks about
Attorney General Gregoire's regret at not being here. As
you probably know, she has many ties to this community
and was very much looking forward to being here. And it
just became impossible for her to do what she needed to
do in Chicago and be here tonight. So she offers her
sincere regrets.

I want to describe briefly the various roles that the Office of the Attorney General plays in connection with the proposed conversion. One role that we will play is the legal advisor to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. As is the case in other state agencies, the Commissioner's office receives legal counsel and litigation support from the Attorney General's Office.

In connection with this conversion, we have lawyers who will be available to provide legal advice to Commissioner Kreidler, as the final decision-maker, with respect to those things that he is lawfully charged to determine in connection with this conversion.

We have a separate set of lawyers on staff who are

Page 9

available to assist the commission staff, the review staff, as Deputy Commissioner Odiorne described it, in the adjudicative hearing. And the bifurcation of our legal staff reflects the requirement in the Administrative Procedure Act that the final decision-maker in an administrative hearing, in effect, be insulated from those people who are participating as advocates.

So as Deputy Commissioner Odiorne mentioned, the commission staff who will be participating as a party in the adjudicative hearing will be screened from the Commissioner. Similarly, the lawyers in my office that will be advising Deputy Commissioner Odiorne and his hearing staff will be screened from the lawyers in my office who will be advising Commissioner Kreidler.

I mention that just because, in the course of this, you may see various Assistant Attorneys General, and you may wonder why some are advising one department and others are advising the other department. And the purpose is just to make sure that the final decision-maker is impartial and isn't approached improperly by people who have a stake in the outcome.

A second role that the office will play is reviewing potential antitrust issues and possible anticompetitive effects of the proposed conversion. The Insurance

Page 10

Holding Company Act specifically calls for the Attorney General's Office and the Commissioner's Office to confer on such issues. There is a group of lawyers in my office who handle antitrust issues. They will review the transaction and make their views and concerns, if any, known to the commission staff.

It is possible that the antitrust lawyers will seek to participate formally as a party in the adjudicative hearing. Whether they do or not depends on what they conclude, and that's their decision. But I mention it because it's at least possible that their review of these issues may, in part, take the form of participating as a party in the hearing.

The third role that my office will play will be to review the plan of distribution of assets that's embodied in the conversion. This proposed conversion would involve, among other things, the dissolution of certain existing nonprofit corporations, and through a sequence of transactions, the funding of new charitable organizations that would perform certain healthcare-related initiatives.

Under the Washington Nonprofit Corporation Act, where there is a proposal to dissolve a nonprofit corporation and that corporation has assets which by law can be used only for charitable or other similar public

Page 11

purposes, the law says that those assets must be preserved for such purposes and must be transferred to a similar private nonprofit entity. What that means is that, in this case, those aspects of the conversion that would involve the transfer of assets from the existing nonprofit corporations to new entities require the Attorney General's approval.

In practical terms our review will involve two major areas of inquiry. One will be to look at the valuation of the assets to make sure that the size of the endowment that is created is appropriate. This will be a very technical, analytical exercise, and I expect that, to a significant degree, we will rely on the investment banking firm and the other technical experts that the Commissioner's Office is engaging to help in the review of the transaction.

The second major area of inquiry will be to look at the nature and structure of the charitable organizations that are proposed to be created. As I mentioned, the Nonprofit Corporation Act, and indeed the common law of charitable trusts, provides that the successor organization has to carry out purposes that are similar to those carried out by the organizations that are being dissolved. So we will look closely at the mission statements and the articles and bylaws of these

Page 12

charitable organizations to make sure that they are, in fact, capable of carrying out the appropriate public services.

My office certainly welcomes input from stakeholder groups and citizens through the pendency of this process. We are in the process of trying to set up a comment line so that, if anyone has comments or concerns they want to make about the conversion and it's not convenient to appear at a public hearing, then we'll have a phone number that you can call seven days a week, 24 hours a day, and tell us what's on your mind. That's not up and running yet, but hopefully it will be in a few days. And I expect we'll have information on our web site about that number.

Thank you very much for coming. We appreciate your interest.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
Assistant Attorney General Fallis. Let me assure you
that the Attorney General and I are working very closely
together. There's no conflict. It is one that we are
linked arm in arm as we approach this very complex and
certainly significant proposal that is before the people
of the State of Washington and the consumers of Premera
Blue Cross healthcare services.

It is my -- next I would -- as I pointed out, we're

Page 13

going to hear from Premera Blue Cross. I would like to call on Mr. Gubby Barlow, who is the chief executive officer of Premera Blue Cross, MSC.

MR. BARLOW: Good evening, Commissioner,
Assistant Attorney General Fallis, and Deputy
Commissioner Odiorne. Thank you for the opportunity to
discuss our proposal to raise capital as a public
company.

For months since we announced our proposal last spring, many people have shared with me their support and also their concerns. People ask me: Why does Premera want to convert? Will Premera focus on Wall Street instead of its members? Will being for-profit cause premiums to rise or squeeze payments to physicians and hospitals? Will Premera executives get huge success bonus when the company converts? Will you remain in rural areas of the state? And does Premera want to be taken over by an out-of-state insurer? And if not, how will Premera prevent it?

I've also seen great interest in our proposal to dedicate 100 percent of the initial stock to funding health initiatives in Washington and Alaska. Many people have strong opinions about how those funds should be spent, who should control the charities, and some are concerned about an accurate valuation of the company.

Page 14

These are important questions that certainly deserve thorough public discussion. I'm confident we can address them all.

A bit more about our company. Premera Blue Cross is a nonprofit Washington corporation, one of the largest private corporations in Washington, with 3,000 employees serving over 1.4 million people in three states. Our roots go back to 1933 in Washington, 1957 in Alaska, and 1994 in Oregon. This year we started a new affiliate in Arizona.

So what is Premera trying to achieve as a business?

I believe people buy health insurance for one primary reason: Peace of mind. This is our mission, providing peace of mind to our members about their healthcare coverage. For us, delivering on that mission means being financially stable, providing broad choices of products, physicians, hospitals, providing excellent service and supporting growth. Growth not only responds to customers' needs, it spreads our operating costs over a larger base, which is a benefit to all our members.

And because all healthcare is local, we believe we can best meet our mission as an independent
Washington-based company. This has been our strategy; it remains our strategy, whether we are nonprofit or for-profit.

Page 15

So why then do we want to convert? Because going public creates more resources to accomplish our mission. This is a highly capital-intensive business. To maintain insurance reserves, to invest in new technologies and products, and to serve more members, as a nonprofit our resources are -- our sources of capital are effectively limited to our operating profits. Those operating profit margins are slim, last year about 1 percent of each premium dollar.

We have explored other sources of capital but have rejected them. For example, another nonprofit Washington health plan explored merging last year with a large health plan in Chicago. That option isn't consistent with Premera's desire to remain independent. It has its headquarters right here in Washington.

I would like now to address some of those concerns I have heard. As for the influence of Wall Street, I've said this before, any company that focuses on shareholders first and its customers and stakeholders second is doomed to fail on both fronts. Our mission and dedication to our members remains the same, whether we operate as a nonprofit or a publicly held company.

Second, going public will not increase premiums or reduce fees for physicians and other providers. Today we are in a very competitive market, competing with

Page 16

for-profit and nonprofits alike. We charge our customers the market price. We pay our physicians and hospitals what the market demands. Clearly these market forces are independent of and unaffected by our corporate form. In fact, Gary Neeson (ph) of Washington Premera has increased our standard rates for physicians by more than 20 percent since January of 2000.

Third, some conversions elsewhere have involved large success bonuses for executives. There will be no success bonuses if Premera converts. In the future, stock ownership plans may be offered to certain of our employees, but our board has yet to address this issue. We will submit any such plan to State officials before you make a decision on our conversion.

Fourth, with some conversions in other states, there have been debates of the value of the company. By dedicating 100 percent of the initial stock outright, the full worth of the company is going directly to support health initiatives. The stock market, which is the most efficient and effective arbiter of value that we know of, will determine the value of that stock.

Five, there are no plans to sell this company, and we remain committed to rural areas. Premera has an independent board of respected community medical and business leaders. Our board has repeatedly determined

Page 17

that we remain independent and based in Washington because that is how we can serve our members best. That's why our conversion plan incorporates all anti-takeover provisions that are available to us by Washington law.

Further, the state's Holding Company Act provides additional protections. In the unlikely event that our board determined to sell, the insurance commissioner would be required to scrutinize any proposed sale with the same due diligence as our conversion.

As for our commitments to rural areas, our track record speaks for itself. Premera's family of companies currently serves every Washington county. We have remained in many counties after other nonprofit and for-profit insurers have left. Where we have stopped selling products in the past, it has been after careful consideration.

For example, we stopped selling Medicare-plus

Choice. We did this because federal funding was

inadequate to cover all costs, including fees, acceptable
to physicians and hospitals.

We believe that, strategically, a statewide network of physicians and hospitals and a statewide presence, including our rural areas, is a valuable competitive advantage that we wish to maintain into the future.

Page 18

In summary, I believe this conversion produces three great wins: A win for our members through increased capital to serve them better; it's a win for the state through a growing company supporting local employment and a tax base; and as a win for the people of Washington and Alaska through a substantial pool of funds that will be available to devote to health initiatives.

Thank you very much. Now, Yori Milo, one of our executive officers, will add some details about our proposal.

MR. MILO: Thank you.

Mr. Barlow explained why Premera seeks to change corporate structure; that is to access capital. I'm going to talk more specifically about what Premera's proposed to do in its Form A filing that's been filed in the Office of the Insurance Commissioner; that is, how we propose to reorganize as a stock company and also to discuss the charitable initiatives that Mr. Barlow discussed.

And to do that, I would like to take a look at the Premera family of companies as it's currently structured today and then take a look at how we would look, how the family of companies would look, after the proposed organization. And we've circulated slides which will be put on a screen.

Page 19

As you can see, the Premera family of companies today is a mix of both for-profit and nonprofit companies. The companies designated in green are nonprofits. The companies designated in blue are for-profits. For example, our main operating company, Premera Blue Cross, which provides health insurance coverage in Alaska and Washington, is a nonprofit and has been a nonprofit from its inception.

By contrast, other companies in the family of companies like LifeWise of Oregon, at the bottom, underside of the chart, is and has always been a for-profit company and sells health insurance in Oregon. Similarly, States West Life is a life and disability company, a for-profit operating in Washington, Alaska, and Oregon and licensed in a number of other states.

So that brings a question: What is the key difference between nonprofits, like Premera, and for-profits. A key difference is share ownership. Four Premera companies have stockholders, and stockholders obtain their shares by paying money into the corporation, which serves as capital and reserves, and serves to support operations of the company.

By contrast, nonprofits have no stockholders, which means that companies like Premera have to raise their -- have to raise their capital through operation, through

Page 20

profits from operations, which is the reason Premera is seeking to reorganize, so it will be able to issue stock to raise capital.

While there are difference between for profits and nonprofits, there are also significant similarities between for-profits and a company like Premera. Contrary to common misperception, Premera is not a tax-exempt charitable organization. It pays both federal and state taxes. In 2001 it paid over \$37 million to the State of Washington, exactly the same amount as it would have paid had it been a for-profit company. And it also paid over \$10 million in federal tax. Another similarity, both for-profit insurance companies and nonprofit insurance companies, and Premera, if it proceeds with a conversion, are and would be regulated by the same rules and regulations from an insurance perspective. No difference there.

Let's take a look at what the Premera family of companies would look like if the reorganization as contemplated by our Form A filing is approved. You can see the companies in blue at the bottom of the chart is the same family of companies that appear in the previous chart now organized in for-profit form, with the ability of the top tier company, New Premera, to issue shares of stock. That would be accomplished through a series of

Page 21

transactions which are described in our Form A filing and require the review and approval of the Insurance

Commission and the Attorney General under the Holding

Company Act and under corporate law.

On the chart you also see several new organizations designated in green, new nonprofit entities which are the vehicle we've proposed to support the health initiatives that would be supported by a charitable endowment created out of the conversion. As Mr. Barlow said, 100 percent of the initial stock created out of the conversion would be given, not sold, given, to the new charitable foundation designated under the new foundation's shareholder. And the purpose of the foundation's shareholder would be to hold and sell the stock and assure that the proceeds are dedicated to support Washington and Alaska health initiatives.

The organization shown on the left of the chart, a new nonprofit charitable organization dedicated to Washington and one dedicated to Alaska, would actually carry out the charitable operations and the distribution of those funds. Those two new charitable organizations would be completely independent from Premera; there would be no Premera control over those organizations, and no representation by Premera representatives on the boards of those organizations.

Page 22

The purposes of these charities? Premera, in the Form A, has proposed a number of purposes including addressing unmet healthcare needs of the uninsured population, education of physicians and nurses and other caregivers committed to serve rural areas, and in some, a legacy endowment to improve healthcare in local communities for years to come. But the Form A filing also recognizes that we're looking to State officials to define what that purposes would be, with input from the community.

Now, we've talked about the charities. The purpose for the reorganization, as Gubby has said, is so that Premera can raise capital for its operations. And the way it would do that is that Premera would have the ability as a for-profit company to issue and sell stock to the public market, that is the stock market, to raise capital for its operational needs.

With that, I would like to thank the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and the Office of the Attorney General for the opportunity to present. And that concludes our statement.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Milo.

Now we come to the part where we open it up for public comment. Let me go over a few details of how that

process works.

Before I do, though, I would like to acknowledge the presence of State Representative Brad Benson, if he would raise his hand. Brad, good to see you here tonight. And representing State Senator Lisa Brown, Amber Lordes (ph). Thank you for coming this evening.

When I call your name, I would like to have you come forward and take a seat here in front of the microphone. You're going to be allowed four minutes to share your comments. And we have a timekeeper over here; Diane will be indicating if the time is getting close for you.

I would ask that you try to keep your comments as succinct as possible. If you have written comments, we would ask you to, perhaps, if it's necessary to stay within the time limit, to summarize them. And Diane will accept any written comments that you have that you would like to have as a part of the record.

As you can see, we have a court reporter here who is recording and transcribing this meeting. It is extremely helpful to her if you will, when you state your name, if you could at least spell your last name for her. Also, if you can speak slowly and not rush your words too much, she can probably appreciate trying to keep up with people if they speak too quickly. And again, if you need to, perhaps, summarize to be a part of the record.

The reason we're limiting the time is to make sure that we have ample time for everybody to have an opportunity to offer their comments. And I'd like to point out that the reason, that the both the transcription of this forum and your comments will be made a part of the record, and they will be available through our web site.

I would also like to point out that we would anticipate -- again, this is the preliminary, early in the process -- that we will be having a second round of public hearings, of which you can be assured Spokane would be one of those locations where we would have a further opportunity to receive public comment. And it would be done at a time when we had additional information available for the public.

We are not prepared this evening to answer questions, engage in rebuttals, or debate. We have questions ourselves. Your questions will, in fact, be made a part of the formal record and made -- and will assist us in the process that we are going through.

With that said, I'm going to begin now by calling the people who have signed up, indicating that they did wish to testify. If they said no, I will obviously -- I won't call them. But if you put a question mark, I will call them last and call those who did make a clear

declaration that they want to testify.

I want to call on Patrick Chestnut. Patrick, state your full name and spell your last name for the assistance of the court reporter, and any organization that you may represent or, certainly, yourself.

MR. CHESTNUT: Thank you, Commissioner. My name is Pat Chestnut, C-h-e-s-t-n-u-t, and I represent the Washington State Farm Bureau.

We are pleased to have the opportunity to present our support for Premera's proposal. We think Premera's actions have been socially responsible and are economically necessary.

After 15 years of healthcare reform in the State of Washington, our 30-plus-thousand members faced a crisis in healthcare because healthcare was not available to farmers and ranchers and small businessmen all across the state. Premera stepped forward and worked with us diligently. Today we ensure over 25,000 people all across the State of Washington. Our program has been very successful. We currently have enrolment growing every month, 25 percent of our new enrolment being the uninsured groups that didn't have insurance previously. And we think that's an important part of Premera's commitment with us, to make sure that our 30,000-plus members have access to healthcare.

Health plans have been operating on a 1970s technology platform. I don't think it's any secret to the providers or the organizations that work with them. In the year 2000, we're all demanding better efficiencies from the health plans. They're going to need the ability to innovate. That's going to require capital. And as we all want stabilization in rates and more efficiency in the system, I think that's a very important part of what CEO Gubby Barlow's talked about.

We work with Premera on a daily basis. We work with them in the provider-relations area. We work with them to make sure that we have fair contracts with our members that are also physicians and partners. And we have found that Premera's been very willing to try to find the solutions.

As we talked about market-based solutions, we see Premera being extremely responsible by opening this process, being available for comment. And also we find that setting up the charitable trusts on the front end of this has proven in historic Blue Cross programs to be extremely efficient and fair to our members and residents of the State of Washington.

As we look forward to Premera's ability to do the conversion, we look forward to being able to innovate with our programs and bring the efficiencies in

Page 27 1 continuing to reach out as our members each month come to us for health care solutions. And we think the support of this proposal in moving forward will continue to allow 4 us to meet the needs of our members. We've been in existence for over 84 years in the 5 State of Washington. We're one of the oldest 6 7 associations. And we believe this partnership with 8 Premera's been extremely productive for our members, and we look forward to working with each of you in how we can guide this process along. And we thank you for this 10 11 opportunity. 12 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, 13 Mr. Chestnut. 14 Frank Yuse. 15 And if I didn't make it clear that we are only keeping to four minutes. I can't remember if I said four 16 17 minutes or not, but four minutes. Thank you. 18 Mr. Yuse. 19 MR. YUSE: Y-u-s-e. I'm speaking on behalf of 20 the Senior Legislative Coalition of Eastern Washington. 21 Thank you for the invitation. 22 We wish to go on record against the proposal of Premera Blue Cross' conversion from a nonprofit to a 23 24 profit-making unit. We're against the conversion for all 25 the reasons you've heard before or will hear in the

future. It's too fast a reversion, and it needs more study, more debate, more research.

Secondly, other states, such as Maryland,
California, Kansas have not been pleased with such
conversion. Why?

Third, Washington State has a history of promoting health insurance of nonprofit companies, not profit.

Fourth, there's a fear that a profit company would raise rates, cut coverage, and increase copayments, and so forth.

Fifth, that our rural areas of Eastern Washington would lose coverage since it's not profitable. You heard the previous speaker, but that's for a nonprofit organization. But what happens after it become a stockholder's bottom line?

Sixth, that bottom line of stockholders will guide many of its decisions on health.

And lastly, the company may sell to another company, which we fear.

What we want to leave you with in judging the pros and cons of this issue is this guiding principle:

Healthcare is a basic human right implied in the Declaration of Independence, life, liberty, and a pursuit of happiness. And you can't have that if you're sick, and that healthcare cannot be a marketable commodity for

Page 29

profit. So we ask you to uphold that ideal, keep that in mind as your guiding principle.

Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Yuse.

And now I would like to call on Mr. Len Eddinger.

MR. EDDINGER: Good evening, Commissioner
Kreidler, Mr. Odiorne, and Mr. Fallis. My name is Len
Eddinger, E-d-d-i-n-g-e-r. I'm the director of public
policy for the Washington State Medical Association.

The WSMA represents over 8,800 physicians and surgeons in our state. On behalf our membership, I am here this evening to offer brief testimony in opposition to the conversion of Premera from a not-for-profit to a for-profit insurance company and to ask you as regulators to slow the process of investigation so that organizations like ours can have more time to study and review this proposal.

At our recent annual meeting in Tacoma, our association unanimously adopted a resolution in opposition to the conversion. Our house of delegates is comprised of physicians from every county and virtually every medical specialty society. Its members come from every type of setting, from academia to large groups to individual practices. I offer this because it's significant that a resolution on such an important

question should pass without a dissenting vote.

Our leadership believes, and it's been told in no uncertain terms, that the proposal conversion is of serious concern to our members. If Premera converts to investor-owned status, physicians across the state fear that the company's attention will turn from concern for its subscribers and the hospitals to increasing financial returns to the company shareholders.

It's a hard fact in reality that managing such a company structure has the fundamental fiduciary obligation to its investors, both institutional and individual, to maximize the return on their investment.

As management's interests turn to increasing profits, our members are certain that will come at the expense of physicians and hospitals, all of which are struggling right now.

Our membership needs answers to many questions which cannot be addressed in a hurried environment. Here are some of our additional concerns. In areas of Washington State where Premera is functionally a single payer, like here in Eastern Washington, what impact does that have on the market and physician and hospital network. Our members feel that it would be negative and that we would receive reduced fees for services, or worse yet, that the company, again needing to satisfy its shareholders, will

Page 31

leave a market where it cannot realize sufficient return on investment.

What exactly is the thinking of management of why it needs to convert to for-profit status? To what use will the newfound capital be put? The experience nationally seems to be that capital raised in such conversions have been used to acquire other plans.

Is Premera positioning themselves to be an acquisition target by some large multistate insurer such as Well Point or Anthem? Shareholder value will be increased through such a sale. How could Premera not sell? Will more attention be paid by management to growing the company, to making it a more attractive acquisition, than to attending to the needs of the subscribers and network in our state? As a for-profit company, will subsequent stock offerings be used to enrich management? What will happen to Premera's commitment to Healthy Options and the State's Basic Health plan?

Finally, we ask you, Commissioner, and Attorney

General Gregoire to ensure that, should you be inclined

to grant this conversion request, that the assets of

Premera be preserved in similar not-for-profit

foundations supporting the health of the community.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here.

Page 32 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Eddinger. I'd like to call on Dr. Beth Peterson. 4 DR. PETERSON: Good evening, Commissioner 5 Kreidler, Assistant Attorney General Fallis, and Deputy Commissioner Odiorne. I am Dr. Elizabeth Peterson, 6 7 current president of the Spokane County Medical Society. 8 That's P-e-t-e-r-s-o-n. And we are an organization representing over 1,000 physicians in Eastern Washington. We would like to go on record as being strongly 10 11 opposed to the proposed plans to convert Premera from a 12 not-for-profit to a for-profit publicly traded company and to the speed with which it may be complete. 13 14 primary goal tonight is to request that you slow the 15 process of approval of that conversion so that our 16 organization and its member physicians can investigate 17 the impact this conversion will have on the delivery of 18 healthcare in Eastern Washington. 19 Our interest is to ensure that already vulnerable 20 medical practices remain available in Eastern Washington, 21 preserving access to care for many in our community. 22 Premera holds a 50-percent share of the health insurance market in Eastern Washington. This is their considerable 23 24 leverage in our marketplace. 25 Although Premera was built on the backs of

Page 33

physicians' organizations across Washington, the fee schedule has long been insufficient. This in turn is largely responsible when practices lose the capacity to absorb the losses from the public programs of Medicare and Medicaid. It is now almost impossible to continue to serve those patients. Physicians already have a difficult time negotiating contracts with Premera. In fact, and in practice, there are very limited negotiations of either the contract provisions or fees.

There is considerable pressure to sign under terms that are not acceptable. Our members are concerned that it will not be possible for the company to maintain the current fee schedule when financial obligations to shareholders exist. This may create a threat to the viability of physician practices in Eastern Washington, with subsequent access problems for patients who reside in our community.

Please look at actual experiences with conversion elsewhere, where payments to physicians declined 10 percent on average. Should it occur in Washington, practice destabilization will follow.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before this hearing.

24 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you,

25 Dr. Peterson.

Dr. Doug Norquist.

DR. NORQUIST: Good evening and thank you

Commissioner Kreidler, representatives from the Attorney

General's Office, and your Deputy Commissioner.

I am Douglas G. Norquist, N-o-r-q-u-i-s-t. I'm current secretary-treasurer of the Spokane County Medical Society -- and I am representing, like Dr. Peterson, 1,000 physicians in Eastern Washington. I would like to reiterate our oppositions to conversion.

However, should conversion occur, I have the following concerns. Premera has stated a desire to remain a regional company after conversion to for-profit status. Despite Premera's stated intent not be purchased later in the foreseeable future, as healthcare costs rise, Premera and its board have a duty to shareholders to maximize the return on investment. Therefore, why would it decline a generous purchase offer in the name of commitment to community? Are Washington's anti-takeover laws even relevant if the board accepts an offer?

It is difficult enough for us to deal with Premera's market power. Imagine the impact on the delivery of healthcare in Eastern Washington if Health Link or Anthem had a 70-percent commercial share.

Secondly, despite the company's assurance that no financial enrichment of the senior management will occur

Page 35

with the successful conversion, they have not ruled out incentive bonuses, including stock options, to be paid to executives after conversion if their board perceives added value to the company and votes to do so.

Finally, we have questions about the protection and use of the current assets of the foundation. Realize first that company reserves were funded not just by premiums but also by an agreement by the physicians who founded the Medical Service Bureau in its infancy to accept lower fees.

We estimate that at least \$140 million of reserve capital, and likely more, has left this community. What assurance do we have that those funds will be returned to the health and welfare of Spokane and Eastern Washington?

We urge you, Commissioner Kreidler and representatives, not only to consider these issues but to also slow the process of approval of this conversion so our members can study and better understand its impact. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you,

Dr. Norquist.

Dr. Bob Hartman.

DR. HARTMAN: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. I'm Dr. Robert Hartman of the Spokane County Medical Society,

Page 36

president-elect, and I would like to continue the views of my colleagues.

First, we reiterate that we believe that the process is moving too quickly. We urge you to allow more time for the necessary study of the impact of this change.

Second, please consider whether Premera's explained its case adequately to justify conversion in the first place. Is the need to increase reserves justified, and is the for-profit capitalization mode the best way to continue. More study by experts outside the company would seem warranted.

Please consider the impact as dominant care in Eastern Washington already has in offering contract to providers on a take-it-or-leave-it basis due to its large market share. Consider also the likelihood of the feasibly declining fees; access for patients will become problematic. Furthermore, retention and recruitment of talented physicians in Eastern Washington is an increasingly urgent problem within our community due to the low reimbursement schedule on the part of Premera.

For all these reasons, we believe more time is needed for our organization and its members, for the people of Washington, to analyze the long-term implication of this conversion.

Please do not deny us this chance. Thank you.

Page 37 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Dr. Hartman. Bill Gotthold. DR. GOTTHOLD: Name is Bill Gotthold, 3 4 G-o-t-t-h-o-l-d. I'm a physician, and I'm the 5 managed-care medical director of the Wenatchee Valley 6 I've worked with Premera for the last 40 years 7 in that capacity. The clinic does not have a position on 8 this question of conversion, but I would like to offer my personal comments. Premera was a difficult company to work with. 10 Their 11 systems and management were difficult to understand. 12 Responsiveness to complaints was poor, and when we ended our managed care contract with them, it was with a sense 13 of relief. In the last two to three years, we have 14 15 witnessed a complete turnaround in the attitude and 16 approach of the company. 17 The first evidence of this was the expansion and 18 reorganization of the pharmacy plans. Decisions are now 19 made on the basis of scientific evidence. We get good data about the prescriptions written by our physicians, 20 21 and we have enough confidence in the formulary to adopt 22 it for our employee plan. Both of these scenarios 23 occurred while Premera was a not-for-profit company. 24 It is my opinion that the financial structure of the 25 company is not nearly as important as the management

philosophy. We deal with not-for-profit hospitals every day and find that business relationships vary greatly.

We find the same variation in the for-profit companies we deal with.

In the highly regulated environment of insurance, any company's ability to exhibit unfettered profit-making behavior is quite -- we will look to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner to continue oversight of all insurance companies regardless of their financial structure. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Dr. Gotthold.

I said before I wasn't going to call those who put a question mark here, but let me do it. And if you would like to speak -- and just so I don't confuse and miss a name here. Laurie Bigej, did you wish to speak? No?

Mike Grimm? David McNab? Curtis Fackler?

MR. FACKLER: Good evening. I'm Curtis

Fackler, F-a-c-k-l-e-r. I want to thank the committee

for coming here to Spokane. And my background is I've

got an MBA in finance and spent 13 years in the

securities and insurance business and currently own a

payroll-human resources firm that does payroll for over

100 firms here in Eastern Washington.

My concern is what they've said before, and I don't

think the type of structure makes a big difference, whether it's profit or nonprofit. But if you look in the world today, most of the great innovations are coming from for-profit companies. So I would say that I think they ought to have an opportunity to do this, with this being described as the perfect storm right now, and we need a way out of this perfect storm and the mess that we're in.

My problem might be is where does the value of this company go? Some people said it might be worth a billion dollars. And who does that belong to? I have some real troubles with the foundation holding that money. Because I look at a lot of other foundations or trusts, whatever we want to call them, and the money does not go where it's supposed to go.

A good example is the tobacco money that this state is receiving, and now the legislature is borrowing against that money for purposes that it wasn't made for. So my real concern is who is going to be on that foundation, who's going to appoint leaders to it, and what's going to be their role.

Also in a corporation, the board of directors is supposed to be elected by shareholders, while the foundation, at the beginning, gets all the shares. Who's going to elect the members of the board of directors of

Premera? That's the real question.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would say that something like this has never happened in the state. My feeling is the value to this company is the policyholders. Why not clear up this whole mess and make it real easy and just say that the, when the stock is liquidated, the policyholders at that time get a refund. That is what happened with the insurance companies became mutualized; they gave the money to the policyholders. Think of the impact of a billion dollars into the hands of the individuals who have been paying premiums for 20, 30 years. So again, I would ask the Attorney General to look at: Is it possible that this money, again, could be given back to the people that put the money into the company, and put back to the policyholders and see if that's possible? may not be, but I would like -- and I would think that may be possible.

Along with that from the public again, I want to make sure the current executives couldn't exercise any stock options for a period of three to five years, again, to make sure that they're not in it to make a big profit.

So in summary, I would just like to say that I believe that the policyholders are the ones that are the value to the company, and the policyholders have been paying thousands and thousands of dollars a year. Why

Page 41 not give that money back to the policyholders today and 1 not worry about the foundation, not worry about who's going to be on it, and have another level of bureaucracy. 4 'Cause that's the way I see the foundation on the 5 organizational chart; they add another layer of bureaucracy. We all know bureaucracy costs money. 6 7 Thank you very much. 8 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Fackler. Leo Greenawalt? MR. GREENAWALT: Thank you for the opportunity 10 11 to speak. My name is Leo Greenawalt, 12 G-r-e-e-n-a-w-a-l-t. I'm the president of the Washington State Hospital Association, a position of over 21 years, 13 14 and this will have some relevance later to what I mention. I'm speaking on behalf of Eastern Washington 15 16 hospitals today. 17 I didn't intend to come to this meeting because insurance isn't an area I know much about. 18 But I can 19 speak factually to a number of things that happened in 20 the last couple of days. 21 First, I have never had an issue, in the time I've 22 been here, where so many hospitals in the eastern side of 23 the state called up and said to me, "You've got to stop 24 this transaction. It's bad for us." 25 Our staff said, "If it's so bad, will you stand up

Page 42

and present to this group tonight?" We couldn't get one hospital to speak up. I started calling some of them saying, "What is going on?" And the first couple comments were, "Don't talk to us about a market in the Spokane area. Premera is 70 percent of the market.

Negotiations, there's no such thing. You take it or leave it, and you usually better take."

And in fact there are stories of incredible intimidation, that if certain rates weren't accepted, Premera would go to the business community or to press. So whether this is true or not, I can't tell you. What I can tell you is that I have members who are petrified to even show up at this point.

I went to the rural hospitals, and there are -- most of the hospitals in Eastern Washington are rural. Most of them are public district hospitals. Nearly all of them are in very bad shape. The message came back similarly. In many of the communities, Premera is the only insurer and the only one that insures their employees as well. They were afraid to even come and talk about that, about the fear of leaving because it might seem to be they were opposing, so I couldn't even get rural people to speak up on it. Look into it whether it's true or not. I can't tell you.

What I can tell you, I have never in my 21 years had

	Page 43
1	people afraid to testify, ever. What I can also tell you
2	is your own Department of Health has at least 12 of
3	the rural hospitals in Eastern Washington are on the
4	verge of closure. The malpractice problem is making it
5	severe. They are convinced, if something happens because
6	of Premera's conversion, it's the end of them. It will
7	be devastating to this community.
8	So I think we have all kinds of questions about what
9	comes after this, what might happen, what kind of
10	guarantees can be made. So I was very encouraged to hear
11	that the Attorney General may be looking into the
12	anticompetitive issues. There are huge issues on the
13	eastern part of the state. It may be different in the
14	west, so I'm glad to hear that. Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you,
16	Mr. Greenawalt.
17	Bill Akers, you didn't indicate whether you want to
18	testify or not.
19	MR. AKERS: No.
20	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Jim Watts?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's not here at the
22	present time, but will be later.
23	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Is he coming back, did
24	you say?
25	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: He'll be back later.

I'm deliberately going a little bit slower out of fear that we've pushed our transcriber a little bit hard in Seattle night before last. So we're trying to be a little bit more thoughtful.

Mark Barglof?

MR. BARGLOF: Good evening. My name is Mark
Barglof, B-a-r-g-l-o-f. I'm an administrator at Lincoln
County Public Hospital, District No. 1, in Odessa,
Washington. I happen to be one of the small rural public
hospital districts that Mr. Greenawalt just referred to,
and we operate in Odessa, Washington.

We happen to be, if not the smallest, pretty darn close to the smallest hospital in the State of Washington and are very concerned about Premera's plans on converting from not-for-profit status to for-profit status. In many areas of the state, particularly in Eastern Washington, in rural Washington, Premera is the only insurer, if not, one of the few. Our concern or our question that I do have is: Will the company seek to be become more profitable by cutting rates to the providers? And also will Premera become more difficult to negotiate with to make a profit?

Many hospitals, particularly rural hospitals, are in dire financial straits. Potential of Premera payment

1 cuts would be the final blow to these hospitals.

Currently Odessa relies on Premera for 55 percent of its commercial insurance business.

Also, will Premera seek to cut physician payments?
We already have very difficult times at recruiting
physicians to places such as Odessa, Washington. And
will this continue to make Odessa and other rural
hospitals a less desirable place for physicians to locate
to?

I thank you for THE opportunity to testify this evening. I have serious concerns about this conversion, and hopefully the Commissioner will take ample time and due diligence in reviewing this request for conversion.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Barglof. Let me assure you, we're going to take, from the standpoint of time, as Mr. Odiorne pointed out, as much time as necessary for us to make sure that we've fully and completely analyzed all of the information that we need in order to make a decision so it will not be a rush decision, no matter what I perceive as a time line. And the time line is going to be dictated by how long it takes to get all the information we need. And I trust that will meet with your satisfaction too.

Barbara Schlimmer.

MS. SCHLIMMER: Hi there. My name is Barbara
Schlimmer, S-c-h-l-i-m-m-e-r. You said that very well.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: I better; I'm German.

MS. SCHLIMMER: I'm the office planner at the
Odessa Clinic, which is part of the Lincoln County Public
Hospital District. I have been back there for, like, 25

years. I am an advocate for rural medicine and people

out there in the rural areas.

My concerns with this type of conversion is what assurances will the plan have that it won't be -- that it will always be offered to the patients, to us? There isn't much out there. As Mark stated, there's 55 percent of our patients on the commercial insurance. In addition to that, we have 45 percent Medicare patients. Their supplements, approximately 60 percent of those have Premera Blue Cross supplement.

I'm also concerned from a provider standpoint. We take a great reduction in fees as it is. Mark alluded to that. It's hard enough to get providers in the rural areas, but to take possibly not -- we need the assurance of not a reduction in fees that are provided, but also assurance that patients will also have access to that insurance.

And those are the parts that concern me, and I'm glad to hear you say that you would slow -- take as long

as is needed, because it seems like this is happening too fast, and we haven't had time to really evaluate it.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

Let me point out that the statute, the holding company statute, specifies that we have -- that once an application is submitted to us completely, we have 60 days. Premera has generously waived that requirement, so this guarantees that we do have ample time to render a decision. So we are not constrained by the statute.

Vic Forni?

MR. FORNI: Vic Forni, F-o-r-n-i. I'm not representing any organization. I'm here primarily to reinforce the importance of, in your decision-making, to consider the overall impact on the accessibility and affordability and availability of both insurance and medical coverage for Spokane, that we have a fairly significant uninsured population, and recognize that this was your number one issue. I hope that -- just want to reinforce that.

Second, Premera, through its history, has been a very strong supporter of community activities and events in Spokane and, again, this is something that I ask you to take into consideration in whatever the future holds, that that commitment to Spokane remains.

Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

	Page 48
1	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
2	Mr. Forni.
3	Is Jim Watts back?
4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.
5	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Cathy Miotke? Debbie
6	Reynolds? Question marks so (Pause.) Janet Holloway?
7	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.
8	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Norm Charney?
9	Charlotte Hardt?
10	MS. HARDT: Good evening, gentlemen. Thank you
11	for being here.
12	My name is Charlotte Hardt, H-a-r-d, as in David, -t
13	as in Tom; another German name.
14	I'm the immediate past president of the National
15	Rural Health Association and was a founding member of the
16	Washington Rural Health Association in 1989 in this
17	state, at which time I was the administrator of a small
18	rural hospital in Richland, Washington.
19	Concerns I have are the same ones you've heard
20	earlier on. They're concerns about the number of
21	insurance companies that are not in our rural counties
22	and the places where Premera is the only one. And we're
23	really concerned about what happens in those counties if
24	we lose the insurance company that we have at this point.
25	It's a major issue for many of our providers in rural

1 communities.

I appreciate your comments about slowing down the process for there to be adequate time, and I appreciate Premera's corporate responsibility. I know that's a little unusual.

The other concern that we have, and I've -- if I'd known about this sooner, I would have probably spent more time in the past year and a half, as I went around the country to other states, asking how things have worked out. It comes up in conversation often when you talk about conversion, what's happened.

There are people who are very happy about it. The rural people in Colorado talk about the Colorado Trust like it was the second coming. They're very pleased about what has been -- they've been able to do in rural communities because of the way the trust monies were put together.

In other states, I've heard some things that make you think that it was the other part of Dante's Inferno that we're seen to be headed for. So part of it's concern about how the foundations are set up, some major concerns that we've just chatted about briefly in some of our rural meetings, about representation and what count rurals might have. I think we all understand that rurals, the numbers of rural people are becoming less and

Page 50 Fewer of them are actually farmers dependent on 1 less. agriculture these days, but we are attracting other kinds of businesses into rural communities. 4 We need to ensure that those people have a voice, 5 and maybe in some ways a disproportionate voice, on this foundation board as well as those who live in our 6 7 underserved urban areas, because those are the people 8 with the least resources to support their needs or to ask for assets. So those are basically the two things I would ask 10 11 you to look at. The assurance we've had about continued 12 coverage in rural areas and the support of physicians, I don't need to repeat those. And then the other concern 13 14 is mainly, if this does happen, be sure that the 15 distribution of the assets and those people that are on 16 the foundation are representative of some underserved 17 parts of our state. 18 Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. 20 Darlene Pursley wish to testify? 21 MS. PURSLEY: My name is Darlene, 22 D-a-r-l-e-n-e, Pursley. Did you...? 23 MADAM REPORTER: Could you spell your last 24 name, please?

MS. PURSLEY: P-u-r-s-l-e-y.

25

Page 51

When I came this evening, I did not anticipate speaking because the article in the newspaper said questions needed to be sent by e-mail or something like that. So I appreciate this opportunity to express my concern and to ask questions.

MS. PRIGGE: Excuse me. Can you move a little closer to the mike so the back of the room can hear you? Thank you.

MS. PURSLEY: I have heard of a virtue extolled of Premera Blue Cross by Mr. Chestnut, and I personally have had excellent service from the Premera Blue Cross policy which I have. My concern is -- and I could not arrive on time, so maybe this has been addressed, and I'm sorry to take your time if it has. But what assurance do we have that this good quality will continue if the company goes private -- I mean, public?

Also, my doctor, my primary care doctor, has just retired because the insurance was too high for him to continue. And I'm sure that it's true that the doctors don't get sufficient funds, and that was one of the factors which was contributing, to not pay the insurance, just can't.

I realize everybody's in a crunch, financial crunch.

I personally have lost over 50 percent of my IRA

investment in the stock market in the last year or two.

Page 52 And I think I'm not speaking only for myself, but for 1 many thousands of others in the state, that the insurance premium is -- although I'm very glad to have this good 3 4 coverage, and I will pay a little bit more for it. But a 5 huge increase would be, well, devastating to me 6 financially. 7 And so I realize that everybody has problems with 8 this, and I appreciate your time. Thank you. 9 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. Jim Watts? 10 11 DR. WATTS: Sorry I missed you earlier. 12 tied up at the hospital, and I just ran in and I've got to go back. And thank you for taking me. I'm Dr. Jim 13 14 Watts, an obstetrician-gynecologist in town. And I would 15 like it say I present myself as a practicing physician OB/GYN. I am a former board member of Medical Service 16 17 Corporation back in '91, '2, '3, '4, around that time. And then I was on the board of Premera. 18 Went off that 19 board approximately two years ago. I think my 20 perspective is sort of that category. 21 When I first joined the board of MSC back in '91, 22 from -- externally it looked like a very prosperous -- it 23 was the largest insurance company on the Eastern 24 Washington side of the state. Everybody thought it was

doing great. But once you got on the board, and once you

25

Page 53

got inside the structure, you found out that they were leaking. They were not keeping current with the infrastructure, with the computers, with the buildings.

This is true, I think, of all Blues across the state at that point in time, and it's true nationally. And nationally there were 75 dependent Blues companies back in 1990, '91, and now I think they're down to about 75. And it's a guess, and correct me if I am wrong, but it's around 74, 75. So you've lost about 20 plans in the last ten years.

And in that time in 1993, '94, it was clear that MSC only had two or three choices, and the MSC board was made up of half physicians and half business leaders in Eastern Washington. And it was clear at that time that either we had to coast along like we were doing and go out of business in two or three years, or merge with someone else, or get taken over by someone else. And I was on the very traumatic meetings where we were deciding.

And luckily we came across Blue Cross of Western Alaska, where their strengths were our weaknesses, and our strengths were their weaknesses. So we worked out a merger around 1994, and it formed a very strong, viable company and worked through that, working with the insurance commissioner at that time and very proud of the

work we did.

I went off the board about two years ago, and at that time it was clear to me that our computer systems and our physical structure was going to deteriorate. And we needed to find some money to recapitalize, and it was very difficult to raise money when you're competing against the for-profits.

At that point I went off the board, so I can't -- I don't know what's happened in the two years since that time, but I suspect that Premera -- and I'm sorry if I'm wrong -- but I suspect right now what's going on is they're in the same boat. They've got three choices:

They can either sort of coast along the next two or three years and gradually go out of business; they can merge with another company, probably for-profit, either midwest, California, or east coast; or they can go for-profit, trying to raise some capital and be a very viable, independent company supporting the northwest, a Washington, Alaska, Oregon company.

I think MSC needed to merge to survive. I think

Premera needs to do something, and if they merge, you're

going to lose the local support. And from the physician

point of view, I don't think there's a company in the

state of Washington that gives us better support than

Premera.

Page 55

There are arguments on all kinds of little things, but from getting responses from -- the administration getting responses from the physician board-type thing is not, I suspect, my experience as a director of Premera is that the board committed to remaining independent.

The consideration to conversion was not really discussed when I was there so this has gone on in the past two years. And I'm not privy to that type of consideration conversation. But I know the three members, physician members that are on the board right now are Dr. Tom Ruan (ph), who was the president of the Spokane County Medical Society president state of -- Washington State Medical Society; Dr. John Golhoffer (ph), who was president of the Spokane County Medical Society and past president of the State of Washington Medical Society; and Tom Walls, who was a neurosurgeon and CEO -- previous CEO of the prescription institute (phonetic) down in California.

These three individuals understand the physician community. They represented the community well. They have been active a long time, both in the WSMA and the private practice of medicine. I know how the board works. They operate with due diligence, and I'm sure these three physicians have worked with due diligence and come to the same conclusion that I did with MSC back in

Page 56

1993 or '94, that something has to give, or gradually the company's going to go out of business, or it's going to be taken over by someone else who has got more capital, meaning a for-profit individual company, or they have to raise capital going for a conversion.

So I feel comfortable that these individuals on the board of business leaders, the board of physicians have looked at this with due diligence. And I'm sure that they're looking at the impact and the welfare of the subscribers, the welfare of the physician partners, the welfare of the state and the region.

My experience as a physician shows that Premera's stuck by the Eastern Washington community. They have remained committed to the rural areas. As I'm sure you know, this is not true in a lot of companies. I think they have worked with Eastern Washington, working with physicians, physician's advisory board to -- for fee schedules, not being on a fee schedule myself, mind you. But I think they try to explain their rationale. They're committed to Eastern Washington and all the region of the Pacific Northwest. In Eastern Washington they have donated over 600,000 hours to the foundation strictly for Spokane and Eastern Washington; done the same thing in Oregon and Alaska and Seattle area.

In summary, I think there are some issues that I'm

Page 57

sure people have brought up here, and I did not, unfortunately, get to listen to. And I'm sure they have to be addressed by you and your commission.

But I think you have to also consider the alternative. In my opinion, I think, if assuming that the -- I think assuming that either they nurse themselves along for the next two, three, four, five years and gradually go out of business, or they get taken over by someone with deep pockets, and the only ones I know with deep pockets are for-profit fellows, and then you lose and representation in Eastern -- in the Northwest; or they go for a conversion.

So what I would highly recommend, vigorously recommend, that you consider allowing them to go for a conversion and work with -- work out the issues that the communities and the -- bring up. And I think you can work with the management to resolve the issues to everybody's satisfaction.

But I think you must look at the down side if this is not allowed to happen. I could explain it in a lot more detail, but I only have three or four minutes, and I don't want to take your time.

Thank you for listening. Any questions or...?

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: We have plenty of questions, but we're abstaining. Thank you, Dr. Watts.

Page 58

I had a question mark from Robert Hartman. Passing?
Glen Stream?

DR. STREAM: Mr. Commissioner, I would like to thank you and your panel members for coming to Spokane and allowing us all to have our concerns addressed. My name is Glen Stream, S-t-r-e-a-m. I'm a family physician here in Spokane, and I represent the Washington Academy of Family Physicians and its 2600 members, many of whom practice in rural and underserved areas in Eastern Washington.

Our organization has no official opinion, but has great concerns about the proposed conversion of Premera to for-profit status. I will not reiterate all of the concerns as expressed by my fellow members from the Washington State Medical Association and the Spokane County Medical Association. But I certainly agree with all of their concerns and would ask, as they have as well, to slow the process in the deliberations about this conversion.

Specifically, my concerns and the concerns of my organization are, if the conversion were to occur, about the assets of the organization and the preservation of those for the public good. As I read on their web site today, Premera's terminology is they we propose that these assets be passed into a foundation for this

purpose. I would ask that there be some greater degree of insurance that this is, in fact, what is accomplished if this conversion occurs.

My greater concern has to do with my understanding of similar conversions elsewhere in the country, where payments to providers, physicians, and hospitals both have decreased by approximately 10 percent. As you are critically aware, Mr. Commissioner, in our state our providers are already critically disadvantaged in reimbursement under state and federal healthcare plans.

Our healthcare practitioners are in jeopardy in many parts of our state in the actual availability of their practices. If there were a 10-percent decrease by a 70-percent-commercial-insurance-market-share company, there would be malpractice failures on a significant scale. And in rural Eastern Washington, if a small town practice closes, the disadvantage to the citizens of that area's considerable, where they would have to go 30 or 40 or 50 miles to access healthcare. I think that it needs to be considered for the citizens of this state, and particularly in Eastern Washington, where those regional issues are so critical.

I'm concerned that, again, as mentioned by others, the concern about the responsiveness of the board of such a company to its shareholders rather than to its insureds

and to the people with whom it does business, the providers.

I understand the concerns by Premera, as a company preserving its future needs for capital. These are certainly not different than concerns that providers in the state that certainly have no access to improvements, that we would like to do.

I am simply not convinced that this conversion is in the best interests of the providers and the citizens of the state and would ask that the pace and the extent of the process and its evaluation be consistent with the importance of this decision for the citizens.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,

Peter Jackson?

MR. JACKSON: Hi. I'm Peter Jackson,

J-a-c-k-s-o-n. And I'm the president of Foundation

Northwest, which is a community foundation here in

Spokane. We serve the ten eastern counties of

Washington, the ten northern counties of Idaho.

And I have really no comment on the viability or the appropriateness of conversion. That's beyond my level of expertise. I would like to acknowledge, however, that MSC Premera has been a solid corporate citizen. They

Page 61

have created a significant endowment in our foundation to provide benefits or access to healthcare for people that do not have insurance.

So I will really be addressing my comments toward the results of the conversion and the issues surrounding the creation of a foundation. If it's determined that a single charitable entity be created for benefit of Washington, I think that there needs to be appropriate guarantees in place that the distribution of those charitable dollars is equitable for the entire state.

As the foundation manager, I can tell you that you have a phrase in our business called Puget Sound myopia, which really refers to, even though you have a statewide board, there is a natural tendency to pay more attention to what's going on on the west side of the state than the east side of the state.

Now, there are also significantly different issues in terms of access to healthcare and health status in Eastern Washington that are more rural in nature, as opposed to the issues of urban access in the western side of the state.

There are other models that exist for the delivery of charitable dollars to provide a way of proportioning those out. There's not time enough in four minutes to go into detail on those, and I would be happy talk with you

Page 62

at another time about that. That can essentially afford and address some of the concerns that people from Eastern Washington have about making sure that those dollars that have been contributed into Premera from Eastern Washington come back.

Secondly, I think that this charitable entity as it's created must be unfettered by a carryover from Premera, both in the transition stage and in its eventual status afterwards. It must be free to operate as it sees fit appropriately, which may even be at times an opposition to for-profit entities.

There are other models besides C-3 conversions that I would urge you just to take look at that may or may not be appropriate for this particular situation. But there is a conversion that occurred in Oregon, Northwest Health Foundation, and the Attorney General and the Insurance Commissioner in the State of Oregon determined that creating a C-4 entity was more appropriate than a C-3 entity because of the C-4's ability to add. And it was really unfettered and unconstrained in terms of acting in the public interest.

So I would hope that you would take those things into consideration as you debate this. This is certainly a weighty issue for the State and, again, thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Page 63 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Jackson. 3 Brian McAlpin? 4 MR. McALPIN: Good evening. I'm Brian McAlpin, 5 M-c-A-l-p-i-n. I'm the administrator of Rockwood Clinic 6 here in Spokane, which is a large multispecialty group. 7 And I thank you for taking your time to hold these 8 important public forums relating to Premera's request to move to a for-profit insurance company. Clearly, as you well know, addressing this request 10 11 does not offer easy solutions and raises many emotional 12 reactions. Accordingly, this complex issue creates certain questions which need to be answered before I can 13 14 make a determination as to the wisdom of such a change 15 and speak either for or against their request. First, I would ask that Premera give assurance for a 16 period of time that, subsequent to their changing to a 17 for-profit company, that they would not sell themselves 18 19 to another larger insurance company since such merger can cause concerns and less-than-positive outcomes in the 20 21 Washington market for patients and healthcare providers. 22 Secondly, I would ask Premera to commit to maintaining a minimum reimbursement level for Washington 23

healthcare providers. This could be defined as a minimum

percent of premium which would be continually budgeted

24

25

Page 64

for healthcare service providers, regardless of economic or profit pressures which may occur in a for-profit status.

Third, I believe the State of Washington and its regulatory and political leadership must commit to using any and all of the foundation monies for providing healthcare to needy Washington residents. It must be recognized that this is not free money. It came from reimbursements not paid to physicians and other healthcare providers. It must not be left unprotected to the whim of Olympia. Accordingly, there must be failsafe walls around these funds so that they can not follow the pathway of the tobacco monies being used as easy fillers for budgetary gaps.

Finally, I find it hard it understand the wisdom in fast-tracking this process because of the complexity and emotions involved. Accordingly, I would encourage your consideration in moving your decision time line back so that analysis does not get rushed.

Having shared these concerns, I must point out that in my two years of dealing with Premera, and for that matter Group Health or other key insurance providers, I have found their local and corporate leadership to be honest and forthright individuals, very concerned for the good of their insured patients while trying to manage

through a healthcare economy being burdened by the state and federal governments shirking their responsibilities.

One only need to look at Premera's support to the diabetes education and many numerous other health programs and community programs for but a few examples which clearly show their integrity and commitment to the health and well-being of their insureds and our patients.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. McAlpin.

Carol Ellis?

MS. ELLIS: My name is Carol Ellis, E-l-l-i-s.

I thank you all for coming to Eastern Washington. I

represent myself as an Eastern Washington citizen for all

my life. I've been in Spokane County for 11 years, in

Stevens County, and I've worked with Prairie County.

And I want you to hear loud and clear how many people speak for the rural people because I have had to visit people in those hospitals. I have had to put buying care for people in those hospitals. And so I just want to affirm that the rural nature of Eastern Washington requires a special condition.

I also want to say that I have been covered by MSC when I was in medical service, purely since I was very young. And I think that the word "service" needs to be underlined and that a lot of the money that was built and

Page 66

the goodwill that was built was built over decades and decades and decades before Premera Blue Cross ever came on board.

I happen to know a physician who was an aide to the president of MSC, and service really was a motive. And so I want to bring into question whether to solve the systematic problems we have nationwide and statewide, if going for-profit is the most savvy move to make, especially because we do have the problems that Eastern Washington presents uniquely.

MSC was made of local physicians, and people who work at MSC have worked there all their lives. And I can say personally that I had no troubles with MSC. It was only when MSC merged with Premera Blue Cross that I ever had to make phone calls or I ever had to go in and visit to explain something.

So I have grave doubts whether it would get simpler because I know that as people age -- I have had to manage care for aging people -- it gets more difficult for them to work through bureaucracy. And so I do have questions about future takeovers. And then that big reserve, I say, was built not just in the last ten years but since World War II and probably someone could say before then. But I was a baby boomer.

So last of all I want to say that Washington State

Page 67 1 has been on the cutting edge in some areas for healthcare, and I would like you to look at the big picture of how to keep us there and look at whether 4 privatization, in this case, in particular really puts us 5 on the cutting edge or takes us down a notch in getting care to our citizens. 6 7 Thank you very much for coming. 8 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. Garth Steele? 9 MR. STEELE: Okay. My name is Garth Steele, 10 11 S-t-e-e-l-e. I've been with MSC for about 20 years. 12 And I guess I thanked the good Lord for insurance because, on big-ticket items, they've done a good job. 13 14 But we've been frustrated trying to get some of these 15 things. My wife's had some health problems, and I just broke my ankle, so I can't work. But trying to get it 16 17 seems like they're covering about 8 percent instead of 25 to 100 percent. And it's just very frustrating at this 18 19 point trying to communicate. 20 These professionals have come here; I appreciate it. 21 I wish to take a look at all the concerns I have before 22 you go ahead and okay this. I guess my main concern is if they -- or a big corporation, is the service going to 23 24 decrease? And the only experience I have, my daughter

was an RN, traveling RN, and she tells me some of the

25

Page 68

horror stories about some of these big corporations in hospitals where she's forced to work with patients without assistance and that don't speak English very well. And yet her head is on the block if they mess up.

So those are some of the concerns that I have, and thank you very much for your time.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Steele.

That does conclude everyone who signed up indicating a desire to testify or speak or ask questions this evening.

Let me point out that this is the second of four meetings that we are conducting around the State of Washington. Again, they are preliminary meetings, and they will be transcribed and available through the -- available through our web site to anybody who wishes to access them.

I should point out that, of the four meetings, two will be held in Eastern Washington, two will be held in Western Washington. The next meeting will be held in the Tri-Cities, followed by Vancouver.

We would anticipate that there will be another round of public meetings that will be conducted once we have a considerable amount of additional information that would be generated by the experts that we have retained. And

Page 69

when that information is available, both to us and to the public, we would anticipate, then, having an additional round. And let me assure you, Spokane is assured of being one of those cities that we will be conducting one of those meetings before any formal meeting takes place.

You can access our web site, and there's an icon there that is marked "Premera conversion," and our web site is www.insurance.wa.gov. There's also a place on our web site and on the conversion web site that -- where you can actually send an e-mail if you wanted to add additional comments. There's also, in that e-mail address, as I said, is there at our web site by conversion@oic.wa.gov. We will also have an opportunity there if you want to be on a notification list that we will then have a way to electronically contact you, if this is your desire.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to all of you who came out tonight and participated in this public process. It is invaluable to me as I go forward and have to make a decision.

Again, this is on a very preliminary basis because that filing was only just really last Friday. The second part of that filing was submitted to our office. As Mr. Odiorne pointed out, the entire filing is available on our web site. The first 500 -- the first some

Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

	Page 70
1	thousand pages were posted already. The additional
2	something-like-500 pages are in the process and next
3	couple days will be posted so that if you want to look at
4	the specifics of the filing, that's there. But other
5	information as it becomes available will also be
6	accessible through that site.
7	I want to once more express my appreciation, both
8	for the Attorney General and for myself in helping us do
9	the job that we need to do. And thank you once more for
10	coming out this evening.
11	This meeting is adjourned.
12	(Proceedings concluded at 7:50 p.m.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

	Page 71
1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, SUE E. GARCIA, a duly authorized Court Reporter and
3	Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at
4	Tacoma, do hereby certify:
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on
6	the 2nd of October, 2002, and thereafter transcribed by me by
7	means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a
8	full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;
9	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
10	counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of
11	any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
14	affixed my official seal this October 8, 2002.
15	
16	
17	
18	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR
	GA-RC-IS-E305QB
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	